

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected pending claims 1-11 of the present application, and did not consider pending claim 12. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, and 9 have been amended. Support for the amendments to these claims may be found in the specification of the present application at least in Line 10, Page 73 through Line 22, Page 75, as well as in Figure 24. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-12 remain pending in the application (although claim 12 has been withdrawn from consideration). The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

In item 3 on pages 2-6 of the application the Examiner rejected claims 1-2 and 5-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,584,466, issued to Serbinis et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Serbinis") in view of the article titled "XML: Not a Silver Bullet, But a Great Pipe Wrench", by Usdin et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Usdin"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

Claim 1 of the present application, as amended, recites an integrated document management system comprising "a printer connected to the client, the printer making a hard copy of a document displayed at the client; wherein the printer makes the hard copy of the document displayed at the client, including overlaid predetermined characters, in response to a tag being included in the management information which instructs to overlay the predetermined characters on the document displayed at the client." The Applicant respectfully submits that neither of the references cited by the Examiner, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests at least these features of claim 1.

Serbinis discloses an internet based document management system wherein access to the system, and services provided by the system, are controlled through the use of access tokens. The services provided by the system may include document storage, collaborative file sharing and workflow, document delivery, and document distribution. However, Serbinis does not disclose, suggest, nor even contemplate a system having a printer which prints overlaid predetermined characters in response to a tag in management information that instructs the printer to overlay the characters.

Further, the Examiner relied on Usdin as allegedly disclosing an XML file defining the hierarchical structure by indicating a relation between a document in the upper layer and a

document in the lower layer, a document type definition file, and a document style sheet file defining a style of each document. However, Usdin also does not disclose, suggest, nor contemplate a system having a printer which prints overlaid predetermined characters in response to a tag in management information that instructs the printer to overlay the characters.

For a proper §103 rejection, the cited references must disclose all of the features of the rejected claim. As discussed above, neither Serbinis nor Usdin disclose or suggest at least an integrated document management system comprising "a printer connected to the client, the printer making a hard copy of a document displayed at the client; wherein the printer makes the hard copy of the document displayed at the client, including overlaid predetermined characters, in response to a tag being included in the management information which instructs to overlay the predetermined characters on the document displayed at the client." Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 of the present application patentably distinguishes over the cited references, and further respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Examiner's §103 rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2 and 5 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2 and 5 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Independent claims 6 and 9 recite similar features to those discussed in regard to claim 1 above, and which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6 and 9 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Claims 7-8 and 10-11 depend from claims 6 and 9, respectively, and include all of the features of those respective claims plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7-8 and 10-11 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

In item 4 on pages 6-8 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Serbinis in view of Usdin, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,893,114, issued to Hashimoto et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Hashimoto"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

As discussed above, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Serbinis and Usdin. Further, as Hashimoto apparently merely discloses updating version number information in management information regarding a document, Hashimoto fails to cure the deficiency of Serbinis and Usdin in regard to claim 1. Therefore, as claims 3-4 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed or suggested in the cited

references, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-4 also patentably distinguish over the cited references.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 6, and 9 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-12 are pending, and claims 1-11 are under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/20/06

By: Thomas L. Jones
Thomas L. Jones
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501